



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/821,811

04/08/2004

Suketu P. Sanghvi

P0453,70115US01

9061

75482

7590

03/12/2009

PROGENICS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

c/o WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 ATLANTIC AVENUE

BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER

JAGOE, DONNA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,811

Applicant(s)

SANGHVI ET AL

Examiner

Donna Jagoe

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 231 and 316-324 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 231 and 316-324 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 231 and 316-324 are pending in this application.

Applicants' arguments filed November 17, 2008 have been fully considered and they are deemed to be persuasive regarding previous rejections of record. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

However, upon reconsideration, the following rejections and/or objections are newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 231 and 316-324 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 231, it is unclear whether the pharmaceutical preparation is comprised of a solution of methylnaltrexone alone – or – a salt of methylnaltrexone and a chelating agent; or if it is intended to comprise a solution of methylnaltrexone and a chelating agent or a salt of methylnaltrexone and chelating agent. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


Claims 231 and 316-324 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0022909 A1 in view of Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences (1975).

Moss et al. teach a solution comprising methylnaltrexone (paragraph 0059). It does not teach the pH and it does not teach a chelating agent per se. However, Moss et al. teach buffering agents such as citric acid in a concentration of 1-3% w/v (paragraphs 0071-0072). Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences teach that citric acid have been long and extensively used for the purpose of sequestering metals. Sequestration has two important pharmaceutical uses: in analysis and the removal or deactivation of unwanted ions in solution. Remington's further teaches that EDTA is another agent that has been studied and employed extensively in the pharmaceutical field.


One of ordinary skill in the art could have substituted one known chelating/sequestering agent for another, and the results of the substitution would have been predictable. It would have been prima facie obvious to substitute one known chelating/sequestering agent for the other. Express suggestion to substitute one equivalent for another need not be present to render such substitution obvious. Regarding the concentration of the chelating agent of instant claims 318-320, Moss et al. teach a concentration of citric acid of 1-3%. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare additional useful compositions of the ranges taught by Moss et al.. While the reference is silent regarding some % ratios, the difference in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless

there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. When the general conditions are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 45, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In the absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results of the additional ranges claimed, the instant invention is considered obvious.

Regarding instant claims 231 and 321-324 drawn to the pH of the solution between 2 and 6 Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences teach that morphine solutions with a pH of less than 5.5 are stable during sterilization at 100°C, however, neutral and alkaline solutions are highly unstable. Based on structural similarity of morphine



to methylnaltrexone,



it would have been obvious to employ a pH of between 2 and 6 for a solution of methylnaltrexone motivated by the teaching of Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences that morphine is unstable at neutral and alkaline pH during sterilization.

Thus the claims fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, the claims are deemed properly rejected and none are allowed.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Donna Jagoe /D. J./
Examiner
Art Unit 1614

March 3, 2009

/Ardin Marschel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614

Application/Control Number: 10/821,811
Art Unit: 1614

Page 7